



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to fight. Our position is like that of a town which has at last discovered the conditions of typhoid fever. We praise the doctors and nurses who have fought the fever. We tell grand stories of heroism in the course of the epidemics. We grant that in ignorant parts of the world there may yet occur visitations of the disease. But we do not propose to make any more elaborate arrangements even to fight the fever. We intend not to have it; we will put an end to the conditions which bring it.

So with war. We ought now to know how not to have war. Surely in the United States, one of its predisposing conditions is big armaments. They predispose to war, precisely as the doubling up of the fist predisposes to a quarrel, whereas the attitude of justice and a friendly temper make and keep the peace. Moreover, we purpose in case of a threatening difference of opinion to use The Hague Tribunal.

This distinctly means that we in the United States do not need to wait for other nations in order to put offensive armaments out of commission. We do not need to wait for others before being honest or truthful or kindly. We will simply do what the strong and intelligent man always does—namely, not look for a quarrel, not feel fear of being attacked, and not carry weapons to provoke his neighbors.

Is not this a fair answer to those who propose to be "Christians?" Be Christians, then, and see if a nation of Christian men, like the brave and strong individual man, is not safer with justice and a constant humane interest than it ever has been when armed to the teeth and in chronic apprehension of its neighbors!

Lucia Ames Mead writes as follows:

"The distinguished gentleman from the South," whose letter in the last *ADVOCATE* expresses certain very common misapprehensions, may find less difficulty when he learns that we distinguish between past and future war and civil and international war. They are in four different categories, all too often confused with dangerous results. One side in some past wars have been right; but if so, the other side was wrong, and the war as a whole could never have been more than fifty per cent just. No future war, if it be between any of the forty-four signatory powers at The Hague, can have excuse for even one side, as more than one substitute for war now exists. No recognized substitute yet exists to prevent civil war, and therefore in future civil war one side might be excused for defending itself against wanton attack. But past or future civil war and past international war must be judged as at best no more "righteous" than a half-rotten apple can be called good.

Peace advocates condemn war, not primarily because it promotes pain, but because it promotes injustice and never aims at a judicial decision. War simply proves who is stronger. Rival armies and navies are the tools of nations preparing for international duelling. The supposed analogy with police has done vast harm. The police of one city never fight the police of another city, nor the militia of one State the militia of another State. They both use the minimum of force to get men to court and their type of force will persist, and some time replace rival armies and navies by a small international police.

Thousands of well-educated citizens are still outside our peace ranks, because they have never seen through the false euphemisms and false analogies with which so many editors have befogged the subject, especially as regards "righteous wars" and "the navy as police."

While not asking for the impossible—immediate disarmament—we ought to demand that the safest nation on earth, which itself forced every foreign war it ever had, should have the courage to lead in the decrease of its monstrous armaments which excite suspicion, incite to heavier burdens in other lands, and imply a disgraceful timidity and fear of non-existent foes.

Democracy and the Jew in Russia.

By Arthur Deerin Call.

War thrives where the people are unhappy. No apology is needed, therefore, for calling attention to one aspect of the distressing situation in a sister nation. The modern spirit of liberalism or democracy is very much alive in Russia. A constitution was granted at St. Petersburg in 1905. Being over twice as large as the United States and constituting the largest single political area of the world, its natural resources, its rivers and harbors, its mines and fields are all calculated to support a great and a progressive people. The population of Russia today is approximately 150 millions. Especially hopeful is the class represented by the intellectuals, the progressive party of Russia. The artists, especially among the literary class, have for fifty years been of the highest order. One has but to recall the satires of Shtchedrin, the somber classic pen-pictures of Turgenieff, the breadth and sympathy of Tolstoi and his friend Menshikoff, the Emersonian touch of Melshim, to demonstrate the high reach of the intellectual leaders there. There are reasons for believing that the next ten years will witness one of the most remarkable and hopeful national developments in Russia of all history.

But there are elements in that broad country making for a decided discouragement. For example, 70 per cent of that great population is illiterate. Many of those in political authority are avowedly afraid to provide education for the unfortunate peasants. There is an iron and a despotic hand held over Poland and Finland. Religious persecutions, strangely mediæval, are still common, now against the Baptists, now against the Roman Catholics, but especially against the Jews, of whom there are in the whole land less than six million. We all remember the horrible massacres at Kechineff. It is difficult for intelligent people to understand the policy of "gagging" the press, so common in Russia. There are reasons for accepting the statement that the Russian government seems to be simply an autocracy limited only by assassination. It sounds very strange to our modern ears that Jewish prostitute women are allowed in St. Petersburg, while Jewish student women are forbidden to live there. The grounds for persecuting the Jews have shifted many times from religious to economic, to political, to personal. Absurd class legislation is still common in that land—for example, Jews are forbidden to serve as superintendents of sugar-beet plantations. The government does not permit families with grown

sons to leave the country. If a boy escapes, the family must pay a large fine. Only three per cent of the Jews are allowed in the universities, and they only of a picked class. Five per cent only of the Jews are allowed in the public schools, even when the public schools are organized and supported by Jews.

We have recently heard much of the strange ritual murder trial. Over two years ago a boy named Yuschinski was found murdered in Kiev. A Jew named Mendel Beilis, found near the murdered boy, was arrested, and after two years of imprisonment put to trial charged with having murdered the Christian boy that his blood might be used for ritual purposes. Ritual murder trials have become an institution in Russia. For centuries the Jews have been charged with this hideous practice. There have been many trials, but never once has a Jew been found guilty. Mendel Beilis has been acquitted; but the strange and discouraging thing about it all is that the Czar of Russia actively affiliated himself with the prosecution.

This racial antagonism is ugly business. In the case of the Jew it seems a strange and inconsistent business. The Christian Bible is a gift from the Jew. The Koran came from the Jew. Gambetta, premier and dictator of France, was a Jew; Count Von Auriem, one of the greatest German diplomats, was a Jew; Lasker, Bismarck's greatest opponent, was a Jew; Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, premier of England, was a Jew; Heine, the Lord Byron of Germany, and Berthold Auerbach, novelist, poet, and philosopher, were Jews; Spinoza, the arch pantheist of modern times, was a Jew; the Russian sculptor, Antokolusky, and Munkacsy, the great Hungarian artist, were Jews; Rubenstein, significantly enough the father of the great school of music in Russia, was a Jew; Rossini and Mendelssohn were Jews; the Rothschilds, England's greatest financiers, are Jews; Baron de Hirsch is a Jew. Many of the rising artisans, scholars, financiers, and statesmen of the world are Jews. Jesus was born of a Jew. Especially at this Christmas season Christianity may well pause and think upon these things.

In one sense we are not born free and equal. No one is less free than at birth, and there is little equality among children. Yet, allowing for all the differences in nature, acquired abilities and opportunities, man has but one vote, one soul, one person. There is an equality which belongs to the dignity of a man by virtue of the fact that he is a man, struggling, even in his weak way, toward the light. A human being is a creation to be treated with reverence, to be considered an equal before the God of life. There is after all a kind of equality which comes from that fellow-feeling which makes us wondrous kind. The accidental discovery of Philips Brooks caring for a sick baby in a slum quarter of Boston is a wondrous picture of the sweet spirit of real equality. "I am as good as you are" is the sad note of democracy. The true ring is "you are or can be as free as I to make good. Let's make good." Personal or national behavior should buttress itself on the basic principle, that every man count as one, be he Jew, Mohammedan, Gentile, or Pagan. Russia will yet get sense that where this principle is dead, there will be war and night; where this principle lives, there will be justice and peace.

The Active Promotion of Industrial Peace as a Primary Policy of the United States.

Professor Paul S. Reinsch, Minister to China.

The people and Government of the United States stand before the world as the principal representatives of orderly international arrangements and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This position has been gained during the period since the first Hague Conference through the able and active support of these principles by our delegations at The Hague. It is not generally recognized abroad how deeply this policy of international peace is rooted in the traditions of our national life. Every important policy that our nation has stood for in its external relations has had peace and a peaceful development of national enterprise for its basis. This is true of the Monroe policy, of the Open Door, of our abstention from European entanglements, and also especially of our relations with our most powerful neighbor, Great Britain. This great policy of the United States is not born of a passing sentiment or enthusiasm, but is connected with the fundamental conditions of our American life.

People in Europe are indeed often skeptical of the real purpose of the United States in advancing this great international policy. This skepticism can be overcome and our position of leadership vindicated only by having our policy in every detail conform to those principles which we advocate before others. No single thing would weaken the position of American leadership, our reputation for national sincerity, more than if we should, for instance, refuse to arbitrate or to settle in some other satisfactory manner the question of the Panama tolls. Nature has given us an advantage of position beyond any European or Asiatic nation. Our freedom from constraint and from besetting rivalries makes it easier for our nation to follow the policy of humanity than for any other, but we should soon lose the advantage which this position affords if, while preaching a policy consonant with the orderly development of humanity, we should be disregarding it ourselves, as soon as minor profits could be made by following an opposite course.

Upon our action, upon our self-restraint and sense of justice, in dealing with such matters as the Panama tolls, the policy of commercial equity known as the Open Door, the treatment of aliens within our limits—our international credit depends. They will determine the extent and power of our influence at the next Hague Conference. This third Conference, following upon an era of war, when international animosities have been sharpened, will have an even more difficult task than its predecessors. Its success depends in no small measure upon the influence which the United States, as a neutral, disinterested, humane power, will be able to exert in pointing out the way to peaceful improvements. There are three directions indicated for the constructive work of the next conference. The American proposal of having the tribunal transformed into a permanent court will be taken up again. The American Department of State has already indicated the purpose of advancing the practice of peaceful settlement by prevailing upon